

## **REMARKS**

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

### **I. Amendments to the Claims**

Claims 1, 8 and 12 have been amended to clarify features of the invention recited therein. Note that claims 1, 8 and 12 have been amended to remove the subject matter identified as not being supported by the specification, as discussed on pages 2-6 of the Advisory Action mailed on September 29, 2011.

Furthermore, claims 1, 8 and 12 have been amended to clarify that the second memory is connected only to the second processing unit. Support for these amendments can be found, at least, in Fig. 1 of the present application. As such, these amendments are clearly supported by the specification and do not raise issues of new matter.

### **II. 35 U.S.C. § 102 and § 103 Rejections**

In the final Office Action mailed on May 9, 2011, claims 1, 7, 8 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Waki (EP 1056290). Further, claims 2-6, 9-14 and 16-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Waki in view of various combinations of Ohba (U.S. 6,714,660), Kawakami (U.S. 2002/0012522) and the Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA). These rejections are believed clearly inapplicable to amended independent claims 1, 8 and 12 and the claims that depend therefrom for the following reasons.

Amended independent claim 1 recites an integrated circuit including a bus, a first memory connected to the bus, a first processing unit that accesses the first memory via the bus, a second processing unit, and a second memory that is accessed by the second processing unit without passing through the bus, such that the second processing unit accesses the second memory without accessing the bus. Further, claim 1 recites that the second memory is connected only the second processing unit.

As discussed during the telephone interview conducted February 28, 2011, the above-described prior art rejections (i) equate the de-multiplexer 303 and the decoder 306 of Waki with the claimed second processing unit, (ii) equate the high-speed memory 307 of Waki with the claimed second memory, and (iii) equate the memory unit 310 and the storage unit 312 with the claimed first memory, as recited in previously presented claim 1. However, in view of the above-identified amendments to claim 1, which clarify the structure of the second memory and the second processing unit, it is submitted that Waki fails to disclose or suggest the above-mentioned distinguishing features now required by the second memory and the second processing unit, as recited in amended independent claim 1.

Rather, Waki teaches that the high speed memory 307 (equated with the claimed second memory) is connected to both the decoder 306 (equated with the claimed second processing unit) and the bus 314, as well as all other components connected to the bus 314 (e.g., IC card 308, CPU 309, memory 310, send/receive unit 311, storage unit 312, communication unit 313, and demultiplexer 303) (see Fig. 2 and paragraphs [0082]-[0092]).

Thus, in view of the above, because Waki teaches that the high speed memory 307 is connected to both the decoder 306 (e.g., second processing unit) and the bus 314, as well as all

other components connected to the bus, Waki cannot be said to disclose or suggest that the second memory is connected only to the second processing unit, as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, because of the above-mentioned distinctions it is believed clear that independent claim 1 and claims 7 and 15 that depend therefrom are not anticipated by Waki.

Regarding dependent claims 2-6, which were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Waki in view of various combinations of Ohba, Kawakami and the AAPA (additional references), it is respectfully submitted that these additional references do not disclose or suggest the above-discussed features of independent claim 1 which are lacking from the Waki reference. Therefore, no obvious combination of Waki with any of the additional references would result in, or otherwise render obvious, the invention recited independent claim 1 and claims 2-7 and 15 that depend therefrom.

Furthermore, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Waki, Ohba, Kawakami and/or the AAPA or elsewhere in the prior art of record which would have caused a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Waki, Kawakami and/or the AAPA to obtain the invention of independent claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 and claims 2-7 and 15 that depend therefrom are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

Amended independent claims 8 and 12 are directed to an electric device and each recite features that correspond to the above-mentioned distinguishing features of independent claim 1. Thus, for the same reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 8 and 12 and claims 9-11, 13, 14 and 16-19 are allowable over the prior art of record.

### III. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Koji KAI et al.

/Andrew L. Dunlap/

By 2011.11.01 10:00:06 -04'00'

Andrew L. Dunlap

Registration No. 60,554

Attorney for Applicants

ALD/cso  
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
November 1, 2011